

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LASHEA T. ALDERSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B178107

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. TA069871)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Kelvin D. Filer, Judge. Affirmed.

Murray A. Rosenberg, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for  
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Pursuant to a negotiated plea, appellant pled no contest to four counts of  
perjury (Pen. Code, § 118), two committed during applications for driver's  
licenses and two during applications for identification cards, and was placed on

formal probation for three years. She, thereafter, filed a motion to withdraw her plea of no contest to these four counts, contending it would be “unjust to saddle [appellant] with four felony convictions in this case—to jump from no felony convictions to four felony convictions on this relatively minor case involving applications for two driver’s licenses.” The motion was denied. She did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

After review of the record, appellant’s court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief requesting this court to independently review the record pursuant to the holding of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.

On December 9, 2004, we advised appellant that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which she wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that no arguable issues exist, and that appellant has, by virtue of counsel’s compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against her in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278.)

### **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

HASTINGS, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P.J.

CURRY, J.